EFFICIENCY CORRELATE 9 – COMPREHENSIVE AND EFFECTIVE PLANNING

Correlate 9: The school/district develops, implements, and evaluates a comprehensive school improvement plan that communicates a clear purpose, direction and action plan focused on teaching and learning.

Indicator	**Ratings of Performance**			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
9.1 DEFINING THE SCHOOL'S VISION, MISSION, BELIEFS	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
DA 9.1a **There is evidence that a collaborative process was used to develop the vision, beliefs, mission and goals that engage the school community as a community of learners.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Mission and belief statements • Executive summary of the Five-Year CEP • School board/subcommittee meeting agenda and minutes • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, community member, parent/family member and school improvement planning team member interviews • Perception surveys	During the development of the school's vision, mission, beliefs and goal statements, representatives of stakeholder groups and Elders confer with and obtain input from their constituent organizations.	**Representatives of stakeholder groups and Elders reflecting the diversity of the school's learning community collaborate to draft and finalize the school's vision, mission, beliefs and goal statements.**	A collaborative process is established that involves teachers and administrators in defining the school's vision, beliefs, mission and goals; but it provides a limited role for other stakeholders (e.g., students, parents, community members).	No effort is made to establish a collaborative process to define the school's vision, beliefs, mission and goals.
	Drafts of these statements were presented by teams composed of representatives of stakeholder groups at open meetings, and public comment was sought and considered prior to final adoption.	**Drafts of these statements were presented to the general public at open meetings, and public comment was encouraged and considered prior to final adoption.**	Drafts of these statements were presented to the general public at open meetings, but opportunity for public comment was not always provided.	Drafts of these statements were not presented to the general public.
	A glossary that explains the words and phrases in the mission statement was developed so that the mission/purpose is clear and the school and community share a common understanding of it (e.g., expected student outcomes including knowledge, skills, values and attitudes).	**School and community share a common understanding of the words and phrases, in the mission/purpose; the mission is clear (e.g., expected student outcomes including knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes).**	School and community share a common understanding of the words and phrases; in the mission/purpose; the mission is not clear.	School and community do not share a common understanding of the words and phrases in the mission/purpose; the mission is not clear.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
9.1a **(continued)**	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	School's mission and vision statements are prominently and frequently displayed and regularly publicized.	**School's mission and vision statements are prominently displayed throughout the school, and regularly publicized.**	School's mission and vision statements are displayed.	School's mission and vision statements are not displayed.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
9.2 DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROFILE	Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:			
DA **9.2a** **There is evidence the school/district planning process involves collecting, managing and analyzing data.** <u>Examples of Supporting Evidence:</u> • Five-Year CEP • Implementation and impact checks • School board/subcommittee meeting agenda and minutes • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • School and district staff member, community member, parent/family member and school improvement planning team member interviews • Student work • Perception surveys • School profile • School report card • Data analysis summaries/reports • Records Management reports • Needs assessment data	The systematic data analysis process includes the identification of trends, projections, and correlations of data, as well as the identification of emerging issues to inform decision-making at the school and classroom levels.	**There is a systematic process for collecting, managing and analyzing data that enables school leadership to determine areas of strength and limitation and that informs decision- making at the school and classroom levels.**	There is a process for collecting, managing and analyzing data that enables school leadership to determine areas of strength and limitation, but the data analysis is not used to inform decision-making at the school and classroom levels.	There is an inefficient process for collecting, managing and analyzing data.
	School profile data are disaggregated, analyzed and disseminated to all staff members who apply the implications of the data to instructional decision-making.	**School profile data reflect the school's overall performance and are disaggregated and analyzed by appropriate subgroups (e.g., gender, race/ethnic group, economic level).**	School profile data reflect the school's overall performance, but the data are not always disaggregated and analyzed by appropriate subgroups.	School profile data does not accurately reflect the school's overall performance.
	The analysis of data is validated against educational research to design curriculum, assessment and instruction that fosters positive change and creates a culture of high achievement for all students.	**The sets of data collected in each area of the profile are integrated and analyzed using a systems approach, and the analysis includes comparison to similar and high-performing schools.**	The sets of data collected for the profile are not always integrated or analyzed using a systems approach.	The sets of data collected for the profile are not analyzed using a systems approach.
	The district establishes and maintains a district-wide, state-of-the-art data management system that is also accessible throughout the district.	**A data management system is in place that allows ready access to the school's longitudinal profile data for revision and analysis over time.**	A data management system is in place, but access to the school's data is difficult and hinders analysis of data over time.	There is no data management system in place.

Correlates and Indicators Guidebook

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.2b** **The school/district uses data for school improvement planning.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Five-Year CEP • Written and graphical data analyses • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, community member, parent/family member and school improvement planning team member interviews • MontCAS reports • Other student achievement data • Needs assessment data • Perception surveys • School profile	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	The collected data are used to anticipate and proactively address future needs.	**The collected data are used to identify and prioritize areas of need for the Five-Year CEP. Student achievement data are a significant part of the data used to identify and prioritize needs.**	The collected data are used to identify areas of need for the Five-Year CEP. Student achievement data are sometimes used to identify and prioritize needs, but they are not used in a consistent and deliberate manner.	The collected data are not used to identify and prioritize areas of need for the Five-Year CEP.
	Analysis of trend data is conducted and is reflected in the objectives of the Five-Year CEP. The data are viewed as a stimulus for improvement, rather than merely a snapshot of current conditions.	**The analysis of the data contained in the school's profile guides the school improvement planning process and is reflected in the objectives of the plan.**	There is some analysis of the data to guide school improvement, but either the implications of the analysis is not fully explored or the analysis is only partially reflected in the objectives of the Five-Year CEP.	Analysis of profile data is not used for Five-Year CEP and/or is not reflected in the objectives of the plan.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
9.3 DEFINING DESIRED RESULTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
DA **9.3a** **School and district plans reflect learning research, current local, state and national expectations for student learning and are reviewed by a planning team.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Five-Year CEP • Standards-based curriculum documents • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, community member, parent/family member and school improvement planning team member interviews • School board/subcommittee meeting agenda and minutes • Professional library/resources • Research findings • Scholastic review/ reports	Staff members implement the educational research findings of the school improvement planning team in designing appropriate instructional strategies that are specified in the Five-Year CEP.	**The school improvement planning team conducts a review of the latest educational research that has implications for student learning and reports its findings to the school leadership and staff members.**	The school improvement planning team conducts a review of educational research, but the implications of the research for student learning are not fully considered.	The school improvement planning team does not conduct educational research.
	School leadership incorporates interdisciplinary school-wide goals for student learning into the Five-Year CEP.	**School leadership considers district and state standards as they work with the school improvement planning team to determine the goals and objectives of the plan.**	School leadership considers district and state standards, but does not use the team's findings to determine the goals and objectives of the Five-Year CEP.	School leadership does not consider district and state standards when determining the goals and objectives of the Five-Year CEP.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.3b** **The school/district analyzes their students' unique learning needs.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Five-Year CEP • Perception surveys • Needs assessment data • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, community member, parent/family member and school improvement planning team member interviews • Documentation of data analysis • MontCAS reports • Other student achievement data • School profile	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	The school improvement team conducts additional surveys of stakeholder perceptions as needed.	**The school improvement planning team (e.g., community, cultural/tribal leaders, Elders, teachers, and parents) conducts an analysis of the results of surveys of stakeholder perceptions on the strengths and limitations of the school in meeting the unique learning needs of students.**	The school improvement planning team surveys stakeholder perceptions on the strengths and limitations of the school in meeting the unique learning needs of students, but either the survey results are not thoroughly analyzed or are not consistently used as a data source for planning.	The school improvement planning team does not survey stakeholder perceptions on the strengths and limitations of the school in meeting the unique learning needs of students.
	The school improvement planning team has established self-assessment mechanisms and collects data to ensure that their efforts are serving the school improvement effort as a whole.	**Data are collected to verify strengths and to establish a baseline in areas of limitation so that improvements in student learning can be monitored over time.**	Data are collected to verify strengths, but the data are not used to establish a baseline in areas of limitation so that improvements in student learning can be monitored over time.	Data are not collected to verify the strengths and limitations of the school in improving student learning.
	School leadership regularly analyzes student performance data and develops a school strategy that empowers teachers and administrators to make decisions that support success for students with special learning needs and for all population subgroups.	**School leadership analyzes student performance data to identify students with unmet special learning needs and to identify achievement gaps within the student population as a whole.**	School leadership analyzes student performance data, but either the analysis is not always used to identify students that have special learning needs or is inadequate to help the school identify gaps.	Data are not considered in identifying student learning needs.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.3c** **The desired results for student learning are defined.** <u>**Examples of Supporting Evidence:**</u> • Five-Year CEP • Student performance level descriptions • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, school board member, community member, parent/family member and school improvement planning team member interviews • School board/subcommittee meeting agenda and minutes	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	The desired results for student learning are regularly defined and modified as necessary.	**The desired results for student learning are clearly and concisely stated, defined in measurable terms and accompanied by benchmarks.**	The desired results for student learning are clearly stated, but not defined in measurable terms or not accompanied by benchmarks.	The desired results for student learning are not stated.
	The desired results for student learning anticipate the needs of the school's population as life-long learners with a focus on access and equity.	**The desired results for student learning reflect meaningful and challenging learning goals and are aligned with the school's vision.**	Some of the desired results for student learning are meaningful and sufficiently challenging, but they are not all aligned with the school's vision.	The desired results for student learning are neither meaningful nor sufficiently challenging.
	School leadership and representatives from all stakeholder groups collaborate to identify the student learning goals and share a sense of responsibility and commitment for achieving the goals of the Five-Year CEP.	**School leadership has identified a manageable number of student learning goals as priorities for the Five-Year CEP. Staff members share a sense of responsibility for achieving the goals of the plan.**	School leadership has identified student learning goals as priorities for the Five-Year CEP, but the number of goals is not manageable or not all staff members share a sense of responsibility for achieving the goals of the plan.	School leadership has not identified student learning goals as priorities for the Five-Year CEP.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
9.4 ANALYZING INSTRUCTIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
DA **9.4a** **Perceived strengths and limitations of the school/district instructional and organizational effectiveness are identified using the collected data.**	Staff members and representatives of stakeholder groups use data triangulation to survey data from multiple sources to corroborate the identification of perceived strengths and limitations of the school.	**Staff members and representatives of stakeholder groups review survey data to identify perceived strengths and limitations of the school to inform school improvement planning.**	Staff members sometimes review survey data to identify perceived strengths and limitations of the school, but the results of the review are not always used to inform school improvement planning.	Staff members do not review survey data to identify perceived strengths and limitations of the school.
Examples of Supporting Evidence: • Five-Year CEP • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, school board member, community member, parent/family member and school improvement planning team member interviews • Needs assessment data • Data analysis summaries/reports • School board/subcommittee meeting agenda and minutes	School leadership ensures that all four types of data (student learning, demographic, perception and school processes) are collected and intentionally used to verify the strength and limitations in the organizational and instructional domains of the school and to validate the goals of the Five-Year CEP.	**Additional data are analyzed to verify perceived strengths and limitations in the organizational and instructional domains of the school to validate the goals of the Five-Year CEP.**	Additional data are analyzed, but the level of analysis is not always sufficient to verify the perceived strengths and limitations in the organizational and instructional domains of the school.	Data are not analyzed to verify the perceived strengths and limitations of the school.

Indicator	**Ratings of Performance**			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	3 Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	2 Limited development or partial implementation	1 Little or no development and implementation
DA	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
9.4b **The school/district goals for building and strengthening the capacity of the school/district instructional and organizational effectiveness are defined.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Action components of the comprehensive school improvement plan • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, school board member, parent/family member, school improvement team member and community member interviews • School board meeting agenda and minutes	School improvement goals are visionary, validated against educational research and balanced between the school's instructional and organizational activities.	**School improvement goals are stated in clear, concise and measurable terms and are focused on building the school's capacity for instructional and organizational effectiveness.**	School improvement goals are generally stated in clear and concise terms, but either are not measurable or are not focused on the school's capacity for instructional and organizational effectiveness.	School improvement goals are not stated in clear, concise or measurable terms.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
9.5 DEVELOPMENT OF THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
DA **9.5a** **The action steps for school improvement are aligned with the school improvement goals and objectives.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Action components of the comprehensive school improvement plan • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, school improvement planning team member and school board member interviews • School board meeting agenda and minutes	The action components of the Five-Year CEP are intentionally focused on equity of academic opportunity and access for all individual students as well as subpopulations.	**The action components of the Five-Year CEP include an intentional focus on closing achievement gaps with specific focus on Indian student populations when applicable among subpopulations.**	The action components of the Five-Year CEP may have an impact on closing achievement gaps among subpopulations, but the focus is not intentional.	The action components of the Five-Year CEP do not include a focus on closing achievement gaps.
	The goals, objectives and activities of the Five-Year CEP are seamlessly integrated into the practice of the school resulting in a culture of high achievement for all students.	**The goals, objectives and activities of the Five-Year CEP are all in alignment.**	Not all of the goals, objectives and activities of the Five-Year CEP are in alignment.	The goals, objectives and activities of the Five-Year CEP are not in alignment.
	Activities in the Five-Year CEP are validated against best practices of similar and high-performing schools.	**Activities in the Five-Year CEP are grounded in research and are sufficient to achieve the objectives.**	Activities in the Five-Year CEP may be grounded in research, but are not always sufficient to achieve the objectives.	Activities in the Five-Year CEP have no basis in research and are not sufficient to achieve the objectives.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.5b** **The plan identifies the resources, timelines, and persons responsible for carrying out each activity.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Five-Year CEP • School board meeting agenda and minutes • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • School board member, staff member and school improvement planning team member interviews	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	The timelines established for the action components in the Five-Year CEP are realistic without compromising educational idealism or detracting from the immediacy of impacting student performance.	**The timelines established for the action components in the Five-Year CEP are realistic and designed to have maximum impact on student performance.**	The timelines established for the action components in the Five-Year CEP are not always designed to impact the student performance.	The timelines for the action plan in the Five-Year CEP have not been established or are unrealistic.
	Abundant resources are available for all activities in the Five-Year CEP, constructing a bridge of support between goal setting and implementation of the plan.	**Adequate resources are identified for all activities in the Five-Year CEP. All funding sources are integrated in the budget to support the plan.**	Limited resources are provided for the activities in the Five-Year CEP, and/or funding sources are not always integrated.	Resources are not identified for the activities in the Five-Year CEP.
	The persons responsible for implementation of the action components of the Five-Year CEP include representatives of other stakeholder groups as well as staff members.	**The Five-Year CEP identifies those persons responsible for implementation of the action components, and this responsibility is shared among staff members.**	The Five-Year CEP identifies the role group responsible for implementation of the action components, but the responsibility is not shared among staff members.	The Five-Year CEP does not identify those responsible for implementation of the action components.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	3 Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	2 Limited development or partial implementation	1 Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.5c** **The means for evaluating the effectiveness of the improvement plan are established.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:**	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	School leadership provides appropriate and timely academic press and support to ensure effective implementation of the activities of the Five-Year CEP.	**School leadership systematically conducts implementation and impact checks to monitor the effectiveness of the activities of the Five-Year CEP over time.**	School leadership conducts implementation and impact checks to monitor the effectiveness of the activities of the Five-Year CEP but the process is not systematic.	School leadership does not conduct implementation and impact checks.
• Five-Year CEP • Implementation and impact checks • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • School board meeting agenda and minutes • Staff member, school board member and school improvement planning team member interviews	School leadership validates the results of data analysis against educational research and makes recommendations for appropriate modifications to the Five-Year CEP.	**School leadership analyzes the data collected through implementation and impact checks and makes appropriate modifications to the Five-Year CEP.**	School leadership analyzes the data collected through implementation and impact checks, but does not always make appropriate modifications to the Five-Year CEP.	School leadership does not review the data collected through implementation and impact checks.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.5d** **The improvement plan is aligned with the school's profile, beliefs, mission, desired results for student learning and analysis of instructional and organizational effectiveness.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Mission and belief statements • Five-Year CEP • Staff member, school board member and school improvement planning team member interviews • Perception surveys • School profile • Needs assessment data • School board meeting agenda and minutes • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:** The action components in the Five-Year CEP are aligned with the mission and beliefs of the school and the district for both long term and short term goals.	**The action components in the Five-Year CEP are aligned with the school's mission and beliefs for both long term and short term goals.**	Some action components in the Five-Year CEP are aligned with the school's mission and beliefs.	The school's mission and beliefs were not considered or did not guide the development of the action components of the Five-Year CEP.
	The action components in the Five-Year CEP anticipate the needs of the school's population as life-long learners and enhance the instructional and organizational effectiveness of the school.	**The action components in the Five-Year CEP support the desired results for student learning and instructional and organizational effectiveness as reflected in the school's mission and beliefs.**	Some action components in the Five-Year CEP support the desired learning results and instructional and organizational effectiveness.	The action components in the Five-Year CEP do not support the desired results for student learning or instructional and organizational effectiveness.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
9.6 IMPLEMENTATION AND DOCUMENTATION	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
DA **9.6a** **The plan is implemented as developed.**	School leadership models a collaborative approach to the implementation of the Five-Year CEP.	**School leadership provides ongoing direction, support and resources for effective implementation of the Five-Year CEP.**	School leadership provides limited direction and support for the implementation of the Five-Year CEP.	School leadership does not provide direction and support for the implementation of the Five-Year CEP.
Examples of Supporting Evidence: • Five-Year CEP • Implementation and impact checks • Staff member, school improvement planning team member and other stakeholder interviews • School board meeting agenda and minutes • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes	Stakeholders know the goals of the Five-Year CEP and are involved in implementing the plan as developed.	**Staff members know the goals of the Five-Year CEP and implement the plan as developed.**	Most staff members are aware of the Five-Year CEP but not all are involved in implementation of the plan as developed.	Staff members do not have sufficient awareness of the Five-Year CEP to be involved in its implementation.

Indicator	**Ratings of Performance**			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	3 Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	2 Limited development or partial implementation	1 Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.6b** **The school evaluates the degree to which it achieves the goals and objectives for student learning set by the plan.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Five-Year CEP • Implementation and impact checks and summaries of data collected • Staff member, school board member and school improvement planning team member interviews • School board/subcommittee meeting agenda and minutes • School improvement planning team meeting agenda and minutes • Perception surveys	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:** School leadership validates the analysis of data against educational research and compares levels of student performance to those in similar and high-performing schools.	**School leadership collects and analyzes data in the areas targeted by the Five-Year CEP, and compares levels of student performance at regular intervals to evaluate the degree to which the goals of the plans are achieved.**	School leadership may collect and analyze data in the areas targeted by the Five-Year CEP, but does not always compare levels of student performance at regular intervals to evaluate the degree to which the goals of the plan are achieved.	School leadership does not analyze data in the areas targeted by the Five-Year CEP for the purpose of evaluating the degree to which the goals of the plan are achieved.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.6c** **The school evaluates the degree to which it achieves the expected impact on classroom practice and student performance specified in the plan.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Five-Year CEP • Implementation and impact checks and summaries of data collected • Staff member, school improvement planning team member, and school board member interviews • School board meeting agenda and minutes • School improvement planning team agenda and minutes • Perception surveys • Management records reports	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:** School leadership validates the analysis of data against educational research and compares levels of student performance to those in similar and high-performing schools to assimilate a culture of high performance expectations into the practice of classrooms and the school.	**School leadership collects and analyzes data in the areas targeted by the Five-Year CEP, and compares levels of student performance at regular intervals to evaluate the degree to which the expected impact on classroom practice is achieved.**	School leadership may collect and analyze data in the areas targeted by the Five-Year CEP, but does not always compare levels of student performance at regular intervals to evaluate the degree to which the expected impact on classroom practice is achieved.	School leadership does not analyze data in the areas targeted by the Five-Year CEP for the purpose of evaluating the degree to which the expected impact on classroom practice is achieved.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
DA **9.6d** **There is evidence of attempts to sustain the commitment to continuous improvement.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Five-Year CEP • Implementation and impact checks • Staff member, school improvement planning team member, parent/ family member, and community member interviews • School board meeting agenda and minutes • School improvement planning team agenda and minutes • Perception surveys • Samples of communications to staff and stakeholders • Media releases • Identified new objectives for improvement • Needs assessment data	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	School leadership ensures that implementation strategies are relevant, appropriate, drawn from research and customized for school context, resulting in a high level of staff support and commitment.	**School leadership implements a systematic and ongoing process to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the school's progress in achieving the goals of the Five-Year CEP. Feedback is collected from stakeholders, and modifications to the plan are made as necessary.**	School leadership conducts a review of the school's progress in achieving the goals of the Five-Year CEP. Feedback is not always collected from stakeholders or used to make modifications to the plan.	School leadership makes no effort to sustain the school's commitment to continuous improvement.
	Formal recognition and celebration of accomplishments are thoroughly assimilated into the practice of the school and are a vital impetus for school improvement.	**School leadership regularly provides school improvement reports to the school board. Accomplishments are formally recognized and celebrated.**	School leadership sometimes provides school improvement reports to the school board. Accomplishments may be noted on an informal basis.	School leadership does not provide school improvement reports to the school board.
	School leadership engages representatives of the learning community in long-term planning to identify new or emerging objectives that proactively meet the anticipated future learning needs of the school's students.	**New or emerging objectives for improving student performance are identified, and activities are selected and implemented to address these objectives.**	New areas for needed improvement may be identified, but objectives are not always specified.	New or emerging areas for improving student performance are not identified.